

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/703,977

Applicant(s)

CORLETO ET AL.

Examiner

David P. Bryant

Art Unit

3726

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David P. Bryant.(3) Shirley Kopecky (app's rep).(2) Sarang Afzali.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 31 July 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: Independent claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: JP 64-47878.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



DAVID P. BRYANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Ms. Kopecky presented a proposed amendment to claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of passing a volatile component through the perforations in the nozzle in an attempt to distinguish the claimed invention from Japanese reference JP 64-47878, which teaches a nozzle for spinning fibers. Mr. Bryant explained that so long as the claims were still directed to the method of manufacturing, and not solely to the method of use of the nozzle, such an amendment could be presented along with an RCE.